

Barton (Wm. P. C.)

To the U. S. SENATE, through the

Hon. George EVANS,

Chairman of the Committee of Finance.

A PROVISIO has passed the House of Representatives attached to the Naval Appropriation Bill, which, in its bearing on the incumbent of the office to which it relates, is illiberal and unjust, and altogether personal. Because it is so, the undersigned protests against it. He appeals to the Senate whether it is constitutional.

The undersigned was appointed to the Bureau without his knowledge. Eligible, according to the law which created it, he was nominated by the President, and confirmed by the Senate, *nem. con.* He was unknown, personally, to the President, except by one of those passing introductions in a polite assembly, which afforded the transient occasion of a few words of ordinary courtesy. The President must, therefore, in having sought for an eligible person to fill the new office, have thrown himself, for information, on the only member of his cabinet capable of giving it—the Secretary of the Navy—that officer selected the undersigned from among sixty surgeons of the Navy. The duties referred to the undersigned have been executed, it is believed, in such a manner as to satisfy that judgment which designated the person as fit for the office. The Secretary of the Navy's Report to the President, which has become one of the public documents of the nation, in express terms, conveys the fact, that the expected duties have been executed by the incumbent, in a manner wholly satisfactory, and exceeding in the saving of public money, his most sanguine expectations. In the full tide of successful experiment, the undersigned has been assailed for correcting abuses of indubitable existence, and for so contriving a system of retrenchment, that it effectually checked the overcharging and overfurnishing of supplies pertaining to the branch of naval service he was called upon to direct.

The undersigned confines himself to those false representations industriously circulated, which relate to his official acts. Among these acts was one of a corrective nature, designed to restrain waste, carelessness, and the misuse of public stores intended for the sick of the navy. The objects of that act were manifold—one was to institute a *sufficient* supply of liquors, where a previous unlimited and excessive extravagance had led to larger outlays of public money, than necessary;—another was to insist, by due accountability, on a safer method of keeping the liquors, when procured under proper restraint and circumspection;—a third, was to instil the propriety of considering those liquors as mere medicines, to be used as other medicines, by directions only emanating from the officers, competent to prescribe them;—a fourth was, to forbid the loaning of them, under any circumstances, because such loaning was well known to have been frequently attended by an omission to return;—a fifth object was, to promote the intention of the well disposed, who had charge of these liquors, by affording a ready reference to the obligations imposed by authority on them, to be mindful of the strict accountability exacted of them by regulations and orders, on an expensive kind of supplies—for the procuring of which, there had never before existed the least hindrance, and for the expenditure of which, no kind of responsibility had ever before been instituted. Although much care in furnishing and preservation was practiced by some—still there was no rule to restrain irregularities in the indiscreet, the careless, or the undutiful. The instrument to accomplish all these objects, was a mere printed lining to be pasted inside the lid of liquor cases, carefully designed and made, to enable the surgeons to carry out their own honest intentions—to secure their liquors safely, and to be of such distinctive character, that they could not be mistaken for the stores of others, no matter where stored on ship-board. If this document conveyed a knowledge of abuses, it bespoke them truly, as such;—if it admonished, that levity on the subject of hospital stores of a tempting kind, was not, in future, to be expected, it conveyed a rebuke, grounded on past derelictions, entirely just and true in substance and in spirit. But none were involved in the declaration of previous abu-

ses, and the avowal that they were known, and must be corrected, except those who were obnoxious to the animadversions and reproof. The best proof, possible, of the good tendency of the official act, is, that the previous extravagant requisitions have ceased ; yet, this salutary act has unnecessarily excited the sensibility of the very officer who had a memorable and well known example of drunkenness, connected with the spirit part of the hospital stores, on board of his own ship.

But to conclude these defensive remarks, suffice it to bring the knowledge to the Senate, of the reform already accomplished, and the documents appended (the official letters of the Secretary of the navy,) that shew, conclusively, that that officer is satisfied, by proof in his Department, of the existence of the evil denounced. The most deplorable case on his records, had its earliest known origin in the ship commanded by the very officer who tells the public he will not admit the truth of the charge. If that officer, while in command, did not know this remarkable case—and it is not necessary to assert that he did—his ignorance of the abuse in question, as one often occurring in the service afloat, is proof irrefragable, that it was not necessary to have gone to sea a great deal in order to detect practices which eluded the vigilance of a captain in his own ship. This incorrigible case has subsequently been reported by two commodores, one captain, and two surgeons, to the Secretary of the Navy, with a list of the different liquors from hospital stores, by name and number of bottles, and the dates between which he abstracted and consumed them. Only a few months ago did these reports cause the arrest of the Surgeon who is the culprit. A more recent instance was reported by the Fleet Surgeon and the Captain of the Independence Flag, to the Secretary of the Navy; and scarcely two weeks have elapsed since the Commodore of the Home Squadron was directed by the Secretary to cause the delinquent (a Hospital Steward) to reimburse the value in money of the liquors embezzled from the spirit room, where they were stowed ; and was further directed to discharge him, in obedience to the report and wish of the Fleet Surgeon, from the service altogether. The letters of several Surgeons are annexed in proof.

The reality of the abuse is thus established, and the act justified which that abuse called for—an act that has been wilfully misrepresented in terms, in meaning, and in design—an act that has been further misrepresented by some and misunderstood by others; having been called a “*circular letter*,” &c., when, in fact, it is a *label of directions for the inside of a liquor case*, and sent to the officers of the navy as an act of courtesy, in order to acquaint them with the legitimate and proper object which caused it to be written and printed.

With regard to the personal misrepresentation of the sea-service of the undersigned, which has been industriously circulated with an avowed object to affect the appropriations of Congress, I have concisely to offer a few words. The statement is disingenuous, and, by concealment, untrue. Six months of sea-service are set forth as the whole of the result of thirty years service in the Navy, while the fact of three years consecutive sea-service up to the period when ill health forced the undersigned from it, has seduously been concealed. It is attempted to convey the idea, that the whole of the naval duty of the undersigned, was comprised in these six months. It has also been stated, that a desire to monopolize the double pay of the army and the navy, caused the undersigned to *refuse* to obey an order to sea during the war! Will any sensible man believe, that Government would for a long period of time, continue to employ, foster and promote to places of honor, trust, and responsibility, an officer who had forfeited his claim to the consideration and respect of that Government, by any unworthy conduct? The highest responsibilities which could be entrusted by the Government from year to year, in its shore naval service, have devolved on the undersigned.

They were followed by still more important and responsible duties in a newly created office. In the army, the undersigned was a volunteer, and as such, his services were accepted. The regulations instituted months after, by the Secretary of War, recognized and confirmed the appointment which was made on the tender of his gratuitous services, by the General of the district in which the

services were performed. The same regulations awarded to the undersigned, in common with all doing similar duty, the pay deemed just as a compensation. It was received, justly received—because awarded by regulations, which were based on the necessity of employing other than army surgeons. Where is the impropriety of this? The Navy Department knew of this employment and this pay. The Secretary of War knew of it; ratified the conditional acceptance of the volunteer services, of the undersigned, and knew, moreover, his situation in the Navy as surgeon, as well as the public duty he then was discharging under the orders of the Navy Department.

To conclude, the undersigned served in two frigates as surgeon under three commanders, from the day his sea-service begun until a serious pulmonary affection, rendered it utterly impossible for a longer continuance in ship service at that time—a period of three years. He was relieved by the urgent necessity of the case. The only order he received during the war, was the one to Commodore Decatur's ship. That officer was the embodiment of honor and heroism, and *that officer obtained a revocation of that very order*, under a full knowledge of all the circumstances of the then employment of the undersigned in Army duty, as well as Naval duty; and with a knowledge too, of the state of his health, then improving but not reinstated. Four years after, he personally, and by letter, used the weight of his name and influence, successfully, to procure for the undersigned a better situation *on shore*, than the one he had previously filled. He was ever the firm and attached friend of the undersigned. If such a man as Decatur saw no wrong in the declination of the order to his own ship: if he undeviatingly bestowed his respect on the undersigned, from the first of his acquaintance with him until the day of his death, can any other man in the Navy be justified in an attempt to impugn the reputation of the undersigned, on that ground?

The copies of autograph letters and official documents are annexed, in substantiation of all that has been said in this communication by the undersigned. The originals

of Decatur's letters, and indeed the originals of the others are in the possession of the undersigned, and have all been seen by the present Secretary of the Navy within a few days past, and by several Captains and other officers officers of the Navy.

All which is respectfully submitted by,

WILLIAM P. C. BARTON,

Washington 11th, Feb. 1843.

(From Commodore Stewart.)

NEW YORK,

November 12th, 1842.

DEAR SIR,

I have received your letter of the 10th instant, and have fully observed the remarks you have made upon the new situation in which the Chief of a Bureau is involved by the reorganization of the Navy Department, having for its object the promotion of economy and responsibility in those who control the naval service. This has long been a desideratum, and, I feel persuaded, will be productive of much national benefit. I fully appreciate the difficulties each of you has had to encounter, and more particularly yourself, as all the forms, regulations, &c., &c., must emanate, as you justly observe, "out of your own head," there being no precedent to copy from.

I do not feel myself competent to pass a decided opinion on the forms and instructions you have transmitted me, in relation to the affairs of your Department. You certainly understand the subject best, and you have at least evinced your industry, as well as your desire to reorganize that department of the service in an efficient way. Should future experience render any change or modification necessary, you will, no doubt, be as alive to admissible improvements as you are to the importance of system and regularity. There is nothing, however, which appears to me objectionable in your efforts, thus far, to carry out the objects of the law. You have only, then, to "go ahead," under the sanction of the Secretary of the Navy, and you will un-

doubtedly accomplish all that may be desirable to the Department, to the service and the country.

I am, very truly, yours,

CHAS. STEWART.

To DR. WM. P. C. BARTON,

Chief of Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

(From the Secretary of the Navy.)

NAVY DEPARTMENT,

19th December, 1842.

SIR,

Your letter of the 10th instant, enclosing statements from Surgeons Haslett and Ticknor, is received.

The very serious impression which the circular of Dr. Barton seems to have made upon a number of officers, has caused me to bestow on it the most critical attention. I confess my inability to see in it any charge whatever against the general character of the navy. It points out an abuse which he supposes to exist; and, which, if it really exist, demands prompt reformation. The language employed does not necessarily convey a charge against the whole navy; it is precisely like every other general reflection on abuses, believed to exist. If it should be said that there are drunkards, or loafers, or dishonest men in the navy, surely those who feel conscious that no such charge can apply to them, will not suppose that they are included in it. They would do themselves great wrong by such a supposition, and so in the present case. The Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, in the legitimate discharge of his duty, points out two abuses which he thinks require correction. The first is, the carelessness of Surgeons in suffering the spirit-part of their stores to be intermixed without those of the officers' messes, without proper distinctive marks. I do not know whether this is a well founded charge, or not. If it is, certainly the surgeons, whose conduct warrants it, have no just reason to complain; for, although they may receive out of the general stock, the same quantity, and, of even more costly character, yet, it does not follow that any other liquors will answer for medical uses, so well as those which are expressly procured for the purpose. If the charge be not true, none but medical officers have a right to complain of

it; and, even they cannot regard it as of a very serious character. It involves *carelessness* in a single particular, and nothing more.

The second abuse which Dr. Barton aims at, is the habit of *borrowing* from the Surgeons the spirit part of their stores. It will be admitted by every one that if this abuse really exists, the rebuke which it has called forth is eminently deserved. That it *has* existed, and probably still exists, is beyond all doubt; *I have the most conclusive proof of it, both from officers and Surgeons.* To what extent it has ever been carried, I do not know, nor is it necessary to inquire; if it exists at all, the order to correct it is altogether proper. What reason then have officers, who are conscious that they have borne no part in such abuse, to complain that a rebuke, meant only for the guilty, applies to them? They have the same reason to suppose that all the Navy officers are included in any other censure which may be pronounced against any other abuse. No abuse is universal; and, except in this instance, it has never been supposed that when any irregularity or improper conduct is charged against the Navy, every officer in it is to be regarded as included. The officers themselves have made such charges as freely as any other persons, and it is creditable to them that they have done so, because it evinces their own exemption from blame, and their desire to correct whatever is amiss in their own corps.

There is reason to think that the officers who have complained so much of this circular of Dr. Barton have not taken a correct view of his position. He is not a Surgeon in the Navy, but a part of executive authority of the Navy Department. In this character he can have no legitimate motive to cast undeserved censure on the service. So far as he may be regarded as speaking the language of the Department, the offensive construction which has been placed on his letter is distinctly disavowed by me. Against those who have merited his rebuke, it must be allowed to stand in full force;—not as a charge of any very serious offence, for as such it was never meant,—but as an irregularity, which ought to be, and must be, corrected.

It certainly never entered into the contemplation of the Department that this, or any other irregularity or abuse,

was universal, or even so general as to include even a majority of the officers: and I am authorized to say, from Dr. Barton's express declaration to me, that he never meant to convey any censure beyond the actual facts of the case; that is, beyond those who had actually participated in the abuse in question.

He knows and freely avows, that the alleged practice never prevailed except among indiscreet officers, and Surgeons equally indiscreet, or too facile in their tempers.— The medical officers whose letters you enclose, have done themselves simple justice, in the disclaimer which they have made.

I wish to do equal justice to Dr. Barton and to the Department, by an explicit declaration that no censure was designed, by the language of his circular, which any officer can justly apply to himself, unless he has shared in the abuse which it was his object to correct.

I am respectfully, your obedient servant,

A. P. UPSHUR.

Capt. M. C. PERRY,

Comd't Navy Yard, New York.

(From Surgeon Lockwood.)

U. S. SHIP VINCENNES,

New York, December 31st, 1842.

SIR,

I believe that various exceptions have been taken to a recent circular issued by the bureau under your charge, respecting liquors for the use of the sick and hurt of the Navy. If the construction some have placed upon that circular, be assumed as correct, the individual integrity of the corps has therein been assailed. I cannot suppose however that such could have been your design, nor does the language of the document convey to my comprehension such an intention.

As I understand its meaning, it has been your purpose to place in a proper view, the circumstances under which they are provided, that no improper use be made of them from wrong notions that may be entertained respecting them; and moreover to guard against carelessness that may render their keeping less secure. From the general tenor of the instrument, I learn, that medical liquors are now regarded in the same light as other medicines, to be used only by di-

rection of the Surgeon, over which direction the patient can exercise no other controlling influence, than he can over opium, or calomel. Many persons in and out of the Navy suppose, that the mere fact of being convalescent implies the necessity of having vinous stimulants: of this necessity constituting themselves the judge, they reflect upon the Surgeon, if he has the temerity to thwart the gratification of their wishes. Now that we are possessed of the views, and directions of the bureau on this subject, it will secure from importunity the medical officers whose facile temper could not otherwise resist the might of influence imposed by the superior rank of his fellow officers. It will still more secure the young assistant Surgeon, whose social position as the occupant of a steerage without any reflected honors even, places him below the stripling Midshipman, whose affectionate mother scarcely "knows he's out."

The liquors for the sick, I believe to be honestly regarded by medical officers, and others; but if the question was roundly stated, has not a larger quantity been used than the absolute necessity of the sick required, the candid would "admit the soft impeachment," that implied not the want of proper conduct on their part, but the entire absence of any rule to regulate the expenditure of this important supply.

I make this statement to disclaim an interpretation of your circular, that would be prejudicial to my character and that of the corps, to which I have the honor to belong.

I am respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

JNO. A. LOCKWOOD,

Surgeon.

To WM. P. C. BARTON, Esq.

Ch. Bureau Medicine and Surgery.

Washington, D. C.

(From the Secretary of the Navy.)

NAVY DEPARTMENT,

31st December, 1842.

GENTLEMEN,

Your letter of the 5th instant is before me.

It gives me very great concern that any portion of the of-

ficers of the Navy should find cause of complaint, in the course pursued by the Department, or by any one of its Bureaus. I am at all times ready and desirous to redress whatever wrong may be done in the exercise of my authority ; and with a view to do so in the present instance, I have examined the circular of Dr. Barton with critical attention. I protest my inability to find in it any sufficient reason for the excitement which it appears to have produced.

Dr. Barton was addressing himself to the Medical Corps of the Navy, and none others. The object which he had in view cannot be misunderstood ; it was to correct an abuse which he supposed to exist in regard to the spirit portion of the medical stores. He admonishes the medical officers that they are not sufficiently careful to keep their stores separate from those of the officers' messes, and to distinguish them by proper labels. Whether the charge is true or not I do not know. If it be, the admonition was very proper, although it implies nothing which ought to give offence. Every Surgeon knows that spirit, wine, &c., laid in for medical purposes, is carefully selected with a view to that particular use, and, therefore, even if the Surgeon should get out of the general supply his proper *quantity*, it would not follow that he would get what would be equally appropriate as medicines for the sick. If, however, the charge be *not true*, I do not see that any other than the Medical Corps have a right to complain of it ; and even they have no very exciting cause of offence, since the charge, at most, is only of *carelessness*, and of *carelessness in a single particular*.

I presume, however, that the passage which has given offence is that which alludes to the *borrowing* of the spirit part of the Surgeon's stores by the officers. You will, perhaps, be surprised to know, gentlemen, that I have the most satisfactory proof that this practice of borrowing *has* prevailed, and you will all readily admit that such a practice merits all the rebuke which it has received. And yet a proper construction of Dr. Barton's letter would extend the rebuke to the Medical officers only ; so far as others are concerned, it is no rebuke at all. If the Medical stores have really been "a stock from which all feel at liberty to borrow," whose fault is it? Surely it was the fault of those only to whose care that stock was entrusted. But even if it be regarded as a charge that Navy officers did borrow, "with

or without an intention to return," and that, in effect, there was a "general omission" to return, every one will admit that the abuse called for correction, and that the individuals concerned in it ought not to escape censure. Yet surely the imputation of such a practice cannot, without the utmost violence of language, be construed "to impeach, in terms not to be misunderstood, the common honesty of the officers of the Navy." It does not impeach the honesty even of those who are supposed to have shared in the practice which is reprobated.

But suppose that it did; take for granted, if you please, that those who borrow are charged with a fraudulent and dishonest design not to return the thing borrowed, or its equivalent, have the officers of the Navy, as a body, any right to suppose that they are so included? Is it necessarily an "imputation upon the officers of the Navy," such as they feel called on to resent, at least in the form of a solemn protest, to say that abuse exists among them? Are they not often tried for abuse and dismissed the service, because they are unworthy of it? And has it ever before entered into the contemplation of the officers of the Navy that the trial of one or two, or as many dozens, of their own number, was an imputation upon them as a body? If it be charged that there are drunkards or loafers in the Navy, will the officers of the Navy be authorized to resent it as impeaching their character as a body? The truth is, that, even if the letter of Dr. Barton be considered as impeaching the common honesty of any one, there is no more reason to extend the reproach to *all* the Navy in this instance than in any one of the thousand others in which that service has been subjected to reproach.

Those, only, who know that they have shared in the abuse, have any reason to feel the rebuke; those who have not shared in it, do injustice not only to Dr. Barton, but to themselves, by supposing that the rebuke was meant for them. I am quite sure that not one of you deserves it.

I have given this hasty and imperfect analysis of Dr. Barton's letter, with a view to show that it does not warrant, if construed with ordinary charity, the injurious interpretation which has been put on it.

I have now to say in addition that Dr. Barton is to be understood as speaking the language of the Department, and the Department distinctly *disavows* the offensive sense in

which this language has been understood. I should do this under any circumstances, but have particular pleasure in being able to say, under the authority of Dr. Barton himself, that he had no such meaning as has been attributed to him. It was far from his intention to cast any imputation of any sort upon the Navy, generally. Under the old organization of this Department, gentlemen, abuses were allowed to creep into the Navy, which have nearly overthrown it.

We all hoped that the new organization would effect the necessary reform, and re-establish the ancient character of the service.

I know that every one, without exception, who is intrusted with any part of this interesting duty is diligently and faithfully working with a sole view to the good of the service.

In the first operation of a new system, there will of necessity, be some clashing and jarring until the different parts shall be properly adjusted. Experience, alone, can teach us how this may best be done.

In the meantime, those on whom the system is to operate, and who will be most benefited by the result, may well ask themselves how far it is their duty, to be cautious of their censures, forbearing in their feelings, and charitable in their judgments.

I am, respectfully, yours,

A. P. UPSHUR.

To Capt. B. KENNON, *Com'r Navy Yard, and others.*

PHILADELPHIA,

January 10, 1843.

DEAR SIR,

You request me to state what knowledge I have in relation to Surgeons of the Navy lending liquors belonging to the Hospital Department.

I have always heard that it was customary, and when I first entered the service I lent them on that assurance, and when I intimated that I wished them returned. I was laughed at, and was told that it was unnecessary. I however purchased the quantity lent, and returned it myself. Since then I have frequently been urgently importuned to lend liquors on assurances that they would be returned, in which assurance I had confidence; but I resolved never to lend more as I thought I had no right to dispose of public

property in any other way than that directed by the Government.

I am, very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

DANIEL EGBERT.

Surgeon U. S. Navy.

To Dr W. P. C. BARTON,

Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

(From Surgeon Barrington.)

U. S. NAVAL HOSPITAL, PHILADELPHIA,

DEAR SIR,

January 12, 1843.

In answer to your note of this date, referring to the "liquor circular," and asking if my experience in any case or cases justifies your opinion that there was occasion to correct an irregularity, I must state that I have seen something of the evil complained of. I have repeatedly been urged to lend liquors belonging to the medical department, and have often given displeasure by a refusal; yet I have in some instances yielded, believing that the articles would be promptly returned. This, so far as I can now recollect, has always been done, except in one instance. On board the U. S. sloop-of-war Hornet, while lying at New York, after a cruise to the West Indies, in November, 1828, I loaned a quart of brandy to the first lieutenant (A. S. Campbell,) which was not returned, perhaps in consequence of Mr. C. having been soon after detached from the ship. Since that time, in the few instances in which I have lent liquors, I have been particular in insisting upon their being returned in proper quantity and quality. The practice has certainly been too common in the Navy, and I consider it an irregularity which requires correction.

I am, very truly, yours, &c.,

SAMUEL BARRINGTON.

To Dr. W. P. C. BARTON.

(From Fleet Surgeon Greene.)

U. S. SHIP INDEPENDENCE,

New York, Jan. 13, 1843.

SIR,

It is with much regret that I report to you, Henry H. Allen, rated on the books as Surgeon's steward, for inattention to duty, drunkenness, and waste or embezzlement of the

Hospital stores, confided to his care. I merely state the facts at this time, and will proceed to ascertain the deficiencies, by comparing the quantities remaining on hand, and the expenditures, with the quantities found on joining the ship, and what has since been received on requisition. His faithless conduct is the more painful and ungrateful, as the Assistant Surgeons and myself have uniformly treated him with kindness and attention.

I would, therefore, respectfully request, that he be compelled to replace the liquors, stores, and articles for which he cannot account; and that he be discharged from the ship and the service. I am the more anxious that he be made to pay for those things, as many who have behaved in like manner, in other ships, have been slightly punished, and turned among the crew. This is not his first delinquency of the kind, and I would be pleased to see him held up as an example to deter others from acting with like dishonesty to the public service, and ingratitude to the Medical officers, who treat them with kindness.

To guard as much as possible against any improper use of the liquors in the Hospital department, they were placed in the spirit room, with the exception of a few bottles of each kind retained in the dispensary for any emergency. Of the small quantity thus kept out, the greater portion has either been drunk, or given away. The spirits of wine, and some of the tinctures kept in the dispensary have, also, been improperly used by him.

I am, sir, most respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

JAMES M. GREENE, *Surg'n.*

To Capt. SILAS H. STRINGHAM,

Commanding U. S. Ship Independence.

(From Captain Stringham.)

U. S. SHIP INDEPENDENCE,

New York, January 17, 1843.

SIR,

I have the honor to transmit herewith a communication from Surgeon James M. Green, attached to this ship, reporting to me, Henry H. Allen, (Hospital steward,) for drunkenness and embezzlement of the public stores, under his charge.

As this man is unfit to fill any other situation in the ship,
I respectfully solicit your order to discharge him from the
service.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

S. H. STRINGHAM,

Captain.

HON. ABEL P. UPSHUR,

Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D. C.

(From Commodore Stewart.)

NEW YORK,

February 2d, 1843.

SIR,

I have the honor to inform you, that in discharging H. Allen, late Surgeon's Steward of the Independence, the value of the Hospital liquors which he had embezzled, was charged against him.

I have the honor to be,

Your obedient servant,

CHAS. STEWART.

To the Hon. A. P. UPSHUR,

Secretary of the Navy, Washington.

(From the Secretary of the Navy, used by permission of Mr. Evans.)

DEAR SIR,

I am just informed that you addressed a letter to me yesterday, relative to the Naval Appropriation Bill, which has just passed the House of Representatives. I regret that I have not seen it: but Mr. Fillebrown informs me that it was a general request for such suggestions as I might choose to offer. The subject is too large for proper examination at this time, and in this mode. I will, if possible, have a personal interview with you to day. Mr. Bayard will meet me here—my office—in half an hour; and I will give to him such explanations as I can offer, on the general provisions of the bill. There is one subject, however, to which I invite your attention, and in regard to which I solicit your particular good offices and assistance. An attempt is made to legislate out of office two of the present heads of bureaus, Dr. Barton and Mr. Goldsborough. How far this can be *constitutionally* done, you are better qualified to judge than I am. Looking only to the practical effect, I cannot sufficiently deplore the step which has been taken. Doctor Barton is as good an officer as I desire to have.—

He is watchful and indefatigable, and his measures have already saved to the country, much more than the whole cost of his bureau. He is correcting abuses, establishing responsibility, and reducing expenses, as rapidly as any one could desire. As to Mr. Goldsborough, his place could not be supplied. He has been more than forty years in the department, and understands it better than any other man in the United States. It is absurd to put a Post Captain in his place. The duties of it require a merchant, and not a sea-officer. A Post Captain qualified to discharge Mr. Goldsborough's duties, would not be qualified for much besides. I could not get along with such help as the bill gives me. The two bureaus at which this blow is struck are effecting more good in the way of reform, than any others, although *all* are doing whatever is possible. The truth is that *more* reform is necessary in these bureaus, and the results of their management, are more readily seen than in any others. I should regret exceedingly the removal of either of the gentlemen in question. Their places could not be supplied by their superiors. And I should regret it the more, because I have reason to believe that the movement had its origin, *out* of Congress, of course in motives not at all creditable to those who entertain them, and certainly not looking to the good of the service or of the country. I earnestly hope that this most unjust and impolitic attempt, will not be allowed to succeed, and that I may have your aid in preserving to the department two of the very best officers in it.

Very respectfully, yours,

A. P. UPSHUR

Sunday, Feb. 12, 1843.

Hon. Mr. EVANS.

U. S. FRIGATE PRESIDENT,
Newport, March 13th, 1812.

SIR,

I have received your letter of the 12th instant.

Captain Porter will be here, I presume, before the departure of the Nautilus; should he not, however, you shall hear from me again in due season.

I am entirely disposed to accommodate you, as far as circumstances and the present state of the medical department of the three vessels here will justify.

Very respectfully,

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN RODGERS.

DR. BARTON.

U. S. FRIGATE ESSEX,

Newport, March 20th 1812.

DEAR SIR,

It is with much pleasure I acknowledge the receipt of your highly gratifying letter of this date, and it is the source of the most pleasing sensation to receive this testimony of the approbation of one whom my duty and inclination both prompt me to esteem for his strict attention to his profession, and for his character as a gentleman.

I cannot but regret the unpleasant circumstance that now renders your absence from duty necessary, and offer you my best wishes for the speedy restoration of your health, and assurances of the extreme pleasure it would afford me to have you again attached to my command.

With the utmost respect,

I have the honor to be, your ob't serv't,

DR. WM. BARTON.

D. PORTER.

U. S. FRIGATE PRESIDENT,

Newport, March 21st, 1812.

SIR,

For the benefit of your health, you are hereby granted a furlough for the term of four weeks, commencing at this date.

At the expiration of this furlough, you are desired to re-join the vessel to which you are now attached.

Very respectfully, your ob't serv't,

JOHN RODGERS.

DR. W. P. C. BARTON.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,

April 3d, 1812.

SIR,

You will repair to Philadelphia, and act as assistant to Dr. Cutbush on that station.

I am, respectfully, yours,

PAUL HAMILTON.

DR. BARTON, *U. S. Navy, Present.*

PENN. RECRUITING DISTRICT,

April 19th, 1812.

Dr. Wm. P. C. Barton, of the U. S. Navy, having offered to perform the duties of Surgeon to the different rendezvous of the district, his services are accepted until further orders from the Head Quarters of the 4th Department. He will be obeyed and respected accordingly.

GEORGE IZARD,

Col. U. S. Arty., Com'g District.

WM. NICHOLS,

*Capt. U. S. Infy. Act'g Adj't.**(From Lieut.—now Capt.—John B. Nicolson.)*

U. S. SHIP U. STATES, NEW YORK,

1st January, 1813.

DEAR SIR,

The Commodore is in want of a *Surgeon*, and has requested me to write you on the subject, and if you will go again in this ship *in that situation*, you will be *so good* as to write me *immediately*, and he will then apply for you to the Department.

Although so long silent, believe me, I have often thought of the many pleasant moments passed in your society, and I as well as my mess will be happy, to call you by the endearing name of *messmate* and *friend*. To Spencer Sergeant will you give my respects, and believe me to be your friend.

JOHN B. NICOLSON.

DISTRICT ORDERS,

Philadelphia, Feb. 1, 1813.

Doctor Wm. P. C. Barton is appointed Surgeon to all the recruiting Rendezvous in and near Philadelphia. His certificate is necessary to pass a recruit, and no other Physician will be called upon, to visit and pass enlisted soldiers, by officers commanding recruiting parties, except in circumstances which will not admit of delay.

GEO. IZARD,

Colonel Artillery, Commanding.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,

February 20th, 1813.

SIR,

Com. Decatur wants a Surgeon, and from his confidence in your abilities, he has asked that you might be ordered to his ship. Anxious, as I am, to give him a Surgeon acceptable to him, I have to direct that you will proceed to New York, and place yourself under his command.

I am, sir, respectfully yours,

W. JONES.

Doct. W. P. C. BARTON, *Philadelphia.*NEW YORK, *March 11, 1813.*

DEAR SIR,

Enclosed is a letter which I have received from the Navy Department with instructions to forward it to you.

I apprised the Secretary of the reasons which you had urged to me, to induce the recall of the order you was under for my ship. I stated to the Secretary, that if they struck his mind with the force they had mine, you would be gratified in your wishes, and some other gentleman substituted, &c.

Will you have the goodness to let me know your determination on this subject as soon as possible.

Your friend, and humble servant,

STEPHEN DECATUR.

Doct. W. P. C. BARTON.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,

16 March, 1813.

SIR,

You will return to Philadelphia and resume your duties as Assistant Surgeon to Dr. Cutbush, Surgeon on that station.

I am respectfully yours,

W. JONES.

Dr. W. P. C. BARTON,

Surgeon U. S. Navy, Present.

DEAR SIR,

November 4th, 1817.

I beg leave to introduce to your acquaintance Dr. Barton, who will have the honor to hand you this letter; he served under my command in his professional capacity during

the years 1809 and 10; and I only do justice to Dr. Barton, when I bear testimony to the great skill and attention and success, with which he practised during the above period.

I would most confidently recommend Dr. Barton to the attention of the Department, for any vacancy that may exist in the line of his profession.

I have the honor to be,

Very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

STEPHEN DECATUR.

To BENJAMIN CROWNINSHIELD, Esq.

LIST OF LIQUORS used in the Florida Squadron under the command of J. T. McLaughlin, Lt., Esq.

	Cost.
Champagne—6 bottles, - - - -	\$9 00
Port Wine—28 gallons and 246 bottles, - - - -	383 00
Madeira and Sherry Wine—5 $\frac{5}{8}$ gallons and 160 bottles,	256 60
Claret Wine—7 boxes and 6 bottles, - - - -	57 00
Brandy—29 $\frac{1}{4}$ gallons and 36 bottles, - - - -	149 75
Gin—12 gallons and 14 jugs, - - - -	55 00
Whisky—24 $\frac{1}{2}$ gallons, - - - -	32 75
Cider—4 boxes and 96 bottles, - - - -	66 00
Brown Stout—48 dozen, - - - -	288 00
Porter—102 dozen, - - - -	530 50
Ale—36 dozen, - - - -	228 50
Bitters—2 bottles, - - - -	1 50
Alcohol—9 $\frac{1}{2}$ gallons, - - - -	16 62
	<u>\$2,076 22</u>

The above liquors were procured for the sick, and paid from the appropriation for "Medicines, &c," and were all purchased within eight months and seventeen days.

